

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 26/11/18

---

**Present:** Councillor Elwyn Edwards – Chair

**Councillors:** Stephen Churchman, Berwyn Parry Jones, Huw G. Wyn Jones, Edgar Wyn Owen, Gareth A. Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Catrin Wager, Gruffydd Williams and Owain Williams.

**Others invited:** Councillors Elin Walker Jones, Dewi W. Roberts and Elfed Williams (Local Members).

**Also in attendance:** Dafydd Gibbard (Corporate Property Senior Manager – for item 5 on the agenda), Gareth Jones (Planning Service Senior Manager), Cara Owen (Planning Manager), Medi Emllyn Davies (Development Control Officer), Gareth Roberts (Senior Manager Development Control - Transport), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Bethan Adams (Member Support Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillors Louise Hughes, Anne Lloyd Jones Eric M. Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd and Cemlyn Williams.

### 1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

- (a) No declarations of personal interest were received from any members present.
- (b) The following members declared that they were local members in relation to the items noted:
  - Councillor Dewi W. Roberts (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 6.1 and 6.3 on the agenda, (planning application numbers C18/0715/39/LL a C18/0865/39/LL);
  - Councillor Elin Walker Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 6.2 on the agenda, planning application number C18/0874/11/LL).
  - Councillor Elfed Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 6.4 on the agenda (planning application number C18/0640/18/LL).

The Members withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussion on the applications in question and did not vote on these matters.

### 2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this Committee, that took place on 5 November 2018, as a true record.

### 3. PARKING ORDER, Y FACH, ABERSOCH

The report of the Corporate Property Senior Manager was submitted in the context of issuing an Off-street Parking Order, for parking spaces near y Fach, Abersoch near the A499 main road. It was explained that over the years motorists had parked on the verge without any regulatory arrangements.

It was noted that in 2017, the Council had invested in a scheme that enabled people to park and cross the road in a safer and orderly manner and the scheme had been welcomed locally. There was a need for regulatory arrangements to ensure that the space was not misused by motorists or caravan users for long periods and to promote a reasonable turnover during the day. It was noted that discussions had taken place with the local member and the Community

Council and they supported the proposal, namely, to introduce pay and display arrangements during the holiday season only (March to October) and to prohibit use by caravans and motorhomes between 10pm and 8am.

It was noted that one objection had been received to this proposal during the public consultation. Reference was made to the summary of the matters noted by the objector together with the Council's response highlighting that increasing the safety of motorists and pedestrians was one of the main reasons for creating this new resource.

It was noted that this parking resource had been created in response to the aspirations of the local community and that the proposal had been advertised in accordance with the statutory requirements and had received overall support with only one objection to hand. It was recommended that the response to the individual points raised by the objector supports and justifies the intention to confirm the Parking Order.

The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee), noted that he supported the Parking Order, and there had been some discussion locally on this issue and what was proposed in terms of pay and display arrangements during the holiday season only and the charge for parking were acceptable. He added that the Community Council had no objection to the proposal.

**RESOLVED to approve issuing an Off-street Parking Order, y Fach, Abersoch.**

#### **4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered the following applications for development.

Details of the applications were expanded upon and questions were answered in relation to the plans and policy aspects.

#### **RESOLVED**

##### **1. Application Number C18/0715/39/LL – 68, Cae Du, Abersoch, Pwllheli**

Two-storey dormer extension, dormer window and balcony to the front and single-storey front extension to existing garage and external alterations to the property.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background to the application, and noted that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 15 October 2018, in order to undertake a site inspection visit. Some members had visited the site prior to the meeting.

It was noted that the applicant's agent had submitted further plans in response to the objectors' concerns regarding the design, overlooking and parking.

It was noted that objections had been received expressing concern about the scale of the extension, however, it was not considered unreasonable in terms of size and scale and was not an over-development of the site as a reasonable amenity area was retained around the house. Given that the design of the existing house was different to the rest of the row and the fact that there were views of it in a built-up context amongst houses of various designs, it was considered that the appearance would not have a significant impact on the street-scene or on the landscape of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Although the local member's concern and those of the objectors were acknowledged, it was considered that there were no grounds to refuse the proposal in terms of design and visual amenities.

She expanded and stated that objections had been received from two neighbours regarding overlooking, privacy, noise and loss of light. It was not considered that the proposal would

significantly make the situation worse, due to the angle of the layout of the property the new front windows would not directly face Cae Du Farm.

It was noted that the proposal was acceptable in terms of design, visual and general amenities and transport, and complied with the requirements of relevant policies.

- (b) The Local Member (not a Member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and made the following main points:-
- He thanked the Committee for visiting the site;
  - There were many holiday homes on the estate with modifications made to houses in order to generate profit at the expense of the Welsh culture and language;
  - Parking concerns on the estate due to the number of visitors to one house;
  - Parties were held on the verandas with food and drink purchased beforehand. This would not benefit the local economy;
  - There was no reference to privacy in the Joint Local Development Plan. The proposal would impact the privacy of the neighbours.
  - Reference was made to paragraph A29 of Policy PPS7 within the national addendum in terms of the distance between buildings in order to reduce overlooking and enable natural light in the buildings. Under paragraph A30 overlooking meant from a room into a neighbour's garden, namely the nearest 3-4 metres to the house.
  - The design was not in accordance with the requirements.
- (c) In response to the local member's observations, the Planning Manager explained that the proposal would not increase the number of bedrooms and would only change the format and as a result the existing bedroom window would change to be a bathroom window. He noted that the impact of the extension, bearing in mind the current impact on nearby residents, would be minimal. He drew attention to Policy PCYFF2 of the Joint Local Development Plan (JLDP) that addresses amenity issues, and although privacy was not stated, this policy did address the matter.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:

- Concern regarding over-development and the impact on nearby residents;
  - Concern regarding the impact on housing prices with housing getting out of reach of local people;
  - Appreciation of the site visit. The balcony would not create over-looking on the farmhouse and as the house opposite was lower down in the ground compared to the house in question, there would be no overlooking from the roof;
  - That other houses on the estate had balconies and the house would be more similar in design to the nearby houses following the modifications;
  - The proposal would not have an impact in terms of light;
  - The proposal was in accordance with the policies;
  - That there were a high number of holiday homes in the area and there was a danger that a precedent could be created by approving the application with house prices increasing;
  - That there were already parking problems with houses getting bigger and the number of cars in the area were increasing;
  - There was no planning reason to refuse the application;
  - Would a lack of parking spaces and over development be grounds to refuse the application?
- (d) In response to the above observations, the officers noted that:
- The application before them was for an extension and consideration had been given in terms of the design and impact on neighbours as part of the assessment. The

recommendation was to approve as it was a moderate extension on the existing house;

- It was necessary to be extremely careful, the only grounds to object to the size of the development was the design and the impact on amenities. Although the point regarding raising value was appreciated, it was not a planning matter as the planning system did not control value. The situation would be different if consideration was given to an application relating to an affordable house, but there was no such restriction on this house and therefore it was not appropriate for this to be used as grounds for refusal. There was a risk of costs to the Council if there was an appeal to a refusal on this basis.
- Refusal on the grounds of a lack of parking spaces would be difficult to support as there was space for three cars and the Transportation Unit had no objection. In terms of refusal on the grounds of over-development, there was not much difference in the house's footprint and therefore it would be difficult to defend refusal on this basis.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Commence within five years.
2. In accordance with the submitted plans and additional plans
3. Slates to match
4. Finish to match

**2. Application Number C18/0874/11/LL – 49, Trem Elidir, Bangor**

Change of use of a house (C3 class use) to a house in multiple occupation (C4 class use).

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that Policy TAI 9 of the JLDP supports the principle of converting existing buildings into multiple occupation housing within the development boundaries subject to meeting four criteria:
1. That the property was suitable for conversion - In considering the size of the building and its current residential use, it was deemed that there was no reason to believe that the building was not suitable to provide alternative living units to its existing use.
  2. The proportion of houses in multiple occupation in any electoral ward should not exceed the specific threshold for the ward - 10% was the current threshold for Glyder ward, with the current percentage of houses in multiple occupation in the ward being 6.2%. Only 2 out of 13 houses with the same postcode were houses in multiple occupation.
  3. There would be no detrimental impact on the residential amenities of nearby properties - It was considered that the impact on amenities from this development in itself would not be significantly different to what could occur under the current legal use and therefore, it was not considered that approving one multiple occupancy unit in the ward would have an additional significant harmful impact on the residential amenities of close neighbours.
  4. Ensure an appropriate parking provision for the development - The Transportation Unit had no concerns regarding the proposal. This development was not considered to be significant in terms of changing the density of the site's use.

It was noted that due to its location in an existing residential location, and that residential use of similar density was proposed here, it was not considered that this development would harm the amenities of neighbours or the area in general.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The Local Member (not a Member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and made the following main points:-
- That local residents and Bangor City Council councillors objected the proposal;

- That the houses in this area were family three-bedroom dwellings with a small garden and a parking space for one car.
- Lack of parking space on the street;
- No need for a multiple occupation house, with 6.2% of housing in multiple occupation in the ward, adding to this number would be an over-development.
- That University accommodation was half empty;
- Young people would create more waste compared to a family, there were already fly tipping issues in the area;
- There would be more nuisance to residents and there was already a fairly high percentage of lawbreaking in the area;
- The location map was misleading;
- The Committee was requested to refuse the application in order to enable the house to be rented by a family, there was no need for further student accommodation, to reduce the pressure in terms of parking and waste as well as to reduce lawbreaking.

(c) In response to the local member's observations, the officers noted:

- That not all applications to convert houses to multi occupation houses were necessarily for students as some professional people lived in such houses;
- Should the application be approved, if there was an aspiration then the house could still be available for a family;
- That 6.2% of housing in the ward were houses in multiple occupation with the ward's threshold at 10%;
- It was recognised that the map was not current, but was sufficient to show the location of the site;
- There was space to store waste within the curtilage;
- The concerns were accepted, however, it would be difficult to prove that there was an over-provision of houses in multiple occupation;
- There was no parking space within the site's curtilage, only some houses in the area had parking space within their curtilages. The parking standards required  $\frac{1}{2}$  a parking space for each bedroom and therefore for this development  $2\frac{1}{2}$  parking spaces were required. This was no different to a family house with two cars, there was on-street parking provision for the site. In addition, the site was within a reasonable walking distance to the City centre with a bus service on nearby streets.

(ch) A proposal was made to undertake a site inspection visit. The proposer noted that he disagreed that the parking provision was sufficient, the internal alterations would prevent it from being a family house and that the proposal was an over-development with the possibility that 10 persons could live in the house and each one with a car. It was added that a site inspection visit should be conducted in order to see the actual situation. The proposal was seconded.

**RESOLVED to undertake a site inspection visit.**

### **3. Application No. C18/0865/39/LL – 4, Cae Du, Abersoch, Pwllheli**

Extension and alterations to the house to include raising the roof level and installation of a rear dormer window (amended application).

(a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that some Members had visited the site prior to this meeting.

She referred to the consultations and noted that the Community Council objected due to over-development, the AONB Unit were satisfied with the proposal and no comments/objections were received during the public consultation period.

It was explained that the main change to the property's front elevation, namely the most prominent elevation, would be an increase of 0.42m to the height of the roof and the introduction of roof-lights to the front roof in order to provide bedrooms in the roof space. She noted that the four bungalows were currently fairly uniform, however, considering the small scale of the increase in height, it was not considered that this would entail a detrimental or significant visual change in this built context and was not bad enough to be refused.

It was noted that there was a hard standing area with space for two cars to park at the bottom of the front garden of the adjacent property and the estate road. She drew attention to the parking spaces that were also along the side of the estate road. The Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal, therefore the proposal was considered acceptable in relation to road safety and parking policies.

It was recommended that the proposal was acceptable for approval in terms of design, visual and general amenities, landscape and transport, and that it complied with the requirements of relevant local and national policies in accordance to what was stated in the report.

- (b) The Local Member (not a Member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and made the following main points:-
- That the proposal was an over-development of the site and there would be overlooking;
  - Houses in the area were used as holiday homes and caused disruption to other residents;
  - Approval of the application would set a precedent in terms of raising the height of the roof;
  - Detrimental effect on the estate residents and the local area in terms of parking and litter;
  - That the Community Council objected the proposal;
  - House prices were going beyond the reach of local people.
- (c) In response to the local member's observations, the Planning Manager noted:
- That it was difficult to state that the proposal was an over-development of the site considering the extensive garden at the back;
  - The extension would be at a lower level than the house at the back of the site and there would be no unacceptable overlooking;
  - That Policy PCYFF 2 of the JLDP protects amenities, there would be no significant increase in the current impact;
  - Although concerns regarding litter were noted, this was a matter outside the planning system;
  - The parking provision was sufficient;
  - Local concerns were accepted and noted, however, there was no planning justification to refuse the application.
- (ch) It was proposed to refuse the application contrary to the officers' recommendation on the grounds of design. It was noted that a flat roof design would impair the rest of the estate and a slate roof would be more acceptable. The proposal was seconded.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:

- Attention should be given to the comments of the Local Member and the Community Council;
- Concern regarding the impact of raising the roof height;
- Concern regarding parking provision;
- No objection had been received to this proposal during the public consultation;
- That the design was more modern compared to other houses on the estate;

- There would only be a small increase in the roof height;
- The proposal would not be an over development of the site because of the size of the site and it was hidden;
- The proposal was in keeping with other houses on the estate and the scale of the extension was acceptable;
- There was use of a flat roof on another nearby house, did not see any grounds to refuse the proposal;
- The proposal would have a visual impact on the building and a pitched roof would be more in-keeping with the estate.

(d) In response to the above observations, the Planning Manager noted:

- That the location of the extension was in a hidden site and would only possibly be visible from the house next door. The hidden site made the proposal more acceptable.

(dd) A vote was taken on the proposal to refuse the application and it fell.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Commence within five years.
2. In accordance with the plans.
3. Slates to match
4. Finish to match
5. Gable-end windows (north West) to be opaque

Notes:

1. The roof of the extension will not be permitted to be used as a balcony.
2. Welsh Water

**4. Application Number C18/0640/18/LL – The Bull Inn, High Street, Deiniolen**

Change of use of former public house into holiday accommodation.

(a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application had been deferred at the Committee held on 5 November 2018 for officers to consult on the business plan and consider this as part of the assessment.

It was explained that the application was to convert the derelict The Bull Inn public house in Deiniolen into self-serviced holiday accommodation with eight bedrooms. The development involved a considerable change to the internal layout of the building but there would not be a significant change to the external appearance.

It was noted that the public house had been closed since 2016 and had been for sale for over a year (between July 2016 and October 2017) and advertised at a low price (£75,000). Should the public house business be viable, it was considered that it would be reasonable to expect that new managers for the business would have come forward during that period. It had to be borne in mind that another public house, namely "The Wellington", was within 20m of this building.

It was highlighted that Policy TWR 2 of the JLDP supports the development of permanent holiday accommodation by converting existing buildings provided that proposals are of high quality. It was noted that there was justification to call the development one of high quality.

It was noted that it was believed that the potential to cause detriment to amenities such as noise and disturbance was more likely from the authorised use, such as a public house, than there would be from self-serviced holiday accommodation as proposed here.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal. In considering the authorised use of the building as a public house, it was not deemed that this development would be likely to cause substantially worse difficulties than the authorised situation. It was noted that the Transportation Unit stated that public parking was available in car parks and on the street within a reasonable distance to the facility.

Reference was made to the business plan submitted by the applicant that explained that the intention was to convert the public house into high quality accommodation for up to 20 guests and stated that there were no similar facilities for large groups, and of this quality, available locally. Attention was drawn to the additional observations received from the Tourism, Marketing and Customer Care Service together with the Council's Rates Unit.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

(b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:-

- It was proposed to provide high quality accommodation for groups at a competitive price;
- The proposal complied with the policies in the JLDP;
- The change of use into holiday accommodation on the second floor had already been approved;
- The building had been advertised for sale for a period of 12 months for a price of £75,000, if use as a public house was viable then it would have been bought and re-opened;
- That such developments in other places were successful and contributed to the local economy;
- There were only three buildings within 20 miles to the site that had provision of the same standard and size;
- That the Tourism Unit identified the need for quality accommodation for groups;
- There was parking provision at the rear of the building and the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal;
- The proposal would bring benefits to the local economy;
- The development would bring a building back into use before its condition deteriorated further.

(c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:-

- The application before them was an improvement on the application refused, however, the size of the rooms remained small. Would it be possible to confirm the size of the rooms?
- One bedroom had doors opening out towards the back of the site and looked out onto a wall, this was not quality accommodation;
- The proposal was contrary to Policy TWR 2 of the JLDP as it was not high quality accommodation;
- Concern that problems would arise similar to Noddfa Hostel;
- Concern regarding the parking provision, lack of parking spaces on the street;
- There were strong local feelings and many letters of objection had been submitted;
- An objector's letter noted that the development of the building was welcomed, however, it was necessary to consider the application in the context of other similar



applications submitted. There had been an increase in the number of similar applications that led to the Anglicisation of the area.

(ch) In response to the local member's observations, the Planning Manager noted:

- That the size of the rooms varied to respond to the requirements of individuals and families, it was considered that their size were acceptable.
- The doors looking out towards a wall was a matter of opinion;
- The parking provision was acceptable with some parking space at the back of the building and two public car parks nearby. Given the existing use, more parking provision may be needed in association with this use compared to the proposed use;
- That the current figures indicated a low percentage of this type of provision in the ward;
- That other planning applications were considered on their own merits;
- That the proposed provision was of high quality and was in accordance with policy requirements.

(d) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the officers' recommendation.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:

- That it was a local public house that was in question and it was local people who used the establishment and therefore it could not be stated that there was a need for more parking provision with the current use;
- The accommodation provision would be for up to 20 guests that could lead to 20 cars, the parking provision was not sufficient for this number of cars;
- There were parking problems in Deiniolen due to the high density of housing;
- Concern regarding the impact of the proposal on residential amenities in terms of noise. There was some control of use of a public house with opening hours;
- Uncertainty if it was quality accommodation;
- That the public house had a Welsh feel and there was a danger to the area's culture and language;
- There was potential for the proposal and in terms of the Anglicisation of the area, the provision was for holiday use;
- Consideration should be given to conduct a site inspection visit to assess the proximity of the building to other buildings and the parking provision;
- The fact that up to 20 guests could stay in the building in eight bedrooms raised questions about the business plan;
- It was a shame to lose a public house but there was no wish for the building's condition to get any worse.

(dd) An amendment was proposed to conduct a site inspection visit. The amendment was seconded.

**RESOLVED to conduct a site inspection visit.**

The meeting commenced at 1.00pm and concluded at 2.35pm.

**CHAIR**